IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH

AT HYDERABAD

HON'BLE Mr. JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY

Writ Petition No. 399 of 2007

Dated: January 05, 2007

Between:

Veerapureddy Sridevi, W/o. Ravindra Reddy,
Aged about 26 years, Occ: Unemployee,
R/o. Lalitha Nagar, Kaluvai Mandal, Nellore
District.

… Petitioner

And

The Govt. of A.P. rep. by its Principal Secretary,
Women Development, Child & Disabled Welfare
(ICDS) Department, Secretariat, Hyderabad, and
others.

… Respondents

Order:

This Writ Petition has been filed by the petitioner, who is an applicant to the post of Anganwadi Worker, seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents 1 to 5 in entertaining the application of the sixth respondent to the post of Anganwadi Workers

in Lalitha Nagar, Kaluvai Mandal, Nellore District as arbitrary and illegal.

2. The case of the petitioner is that she passed S.S.C. in second division in March, 1997, and is a resident of Lalitha Nagar, Kaluvai Mandal, Nellore District. It is stated that the fourth respondent, the Project Director, ICDS, Nellore District, has issued notification, inviting applications for appointment to the post of Anganwadi Workers in Lalitha Nagar, Kaluvai Mandal, Nellore District. It is stated that as per the norms notified, the applicant should be local resident of the said village. The grievance of the petitioner is that though sixth respondent is not a resident of the said village and is a resident of Nethajinagar, Nellore, and married to one Mr. Gangireddy Narayana Reddy of Nethajinagar, respondents have sent call letter to the sixth respondent to attend interview for the aforesaid post. It is stated that petitioner has submitted a representation dated 25-09-2006 to fourth respondent bringing to his notice about the ineligibility of the sixth respondent, however no action has yet been taken.

3. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Pleader for Women Development and Child Welfare appearing for the respondents.

4. Admittedly, no final orders have been passed after interviews were conducted to the aforesaid post. Merely because a call letter is sent to an interviewee, it cannot be construed that he/she is appointed to the said post. In this case, merely because the sixth respondent was called for interview, it cannot be presumed that she will be appointed.

5. As much as it is stated that the petitioner was called for interview

on 30-12-2006 and he has also submitted representation dated 25-09-2006 to the fourth respondent pointing the ineligibility of the sixth respondent, I deem it appropriate dispose of the Writ Petition with a limited direction, directing the fourth respondent to consider the said representation of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders before final selections are made for appointment to the post of Anganwadi Workers in Lalitha Nagar, Kaluvai Mandal, Nellore District.

6. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. No order as to costs.

JUSTICE R. SUBHASH REDDY.

January 05, 2007
N.B. **Furnish C.C. in three days**
B.O.
MRR